The Honorable Marc L. Barreca Chapter 7 Hearing Location: via ZoomGov 2 Hearing Date/Time: March 23, 2022 at 10:00 AM Response Due: March 16, 2022 3 Replies Due: March 18, 2022 4 5 6 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 7 8 NO. 18-14536-MLB In re 9 DECLARATION OF S. TODD SIPE IN TIMOTHY DONALD EYMAN, 10 SUPPORT OF STATE OF WASHINGTON'S **OBJECTION TO:** Debtor. 11 GOODSTEIN LAW GROUP'S FIFTH 12 APPLICATION FOR COMPENSATION; AND, 13 14 2) VORTMAN & FEINSTEIN'S FINAL APPLICATION FOR COMPENSATION FOR 15 APRIL 8, 2020 TO DECEMBER 17, 2021 16 I, S. TODD SIPE, declare as follows: 17 18 1. I am over the age of 18 and competent to testify on the matters contained in this declaration 19 and make this declaration based on my personal knowledge. I am an Assistant Attorney 20 General with the Washington State Attorney General's Office, who was one of the attorneys 21 representing the State of Washington (State) in the campaign finance enforcement action that 22 resulted in a judgment against Tim Eyman (Eyman) in Thurston County Superior Court 23 (Case No. 17-2-01546-34). I am also one of the attorneys representing the State in Eyman's 24 appeal of that judgment. 25 26

DECLARATION OF S. TODD SIPE IN SUPPORT OF STATE OF WASHINGTON'S OBJECTION TO APPLICATIONS FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL Bankruptcy & Collections Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, Washington 98104-3188 Phone: (206) 389-2187 – Fax (206) 587-5150

1

- 2. On September 14, 2021, the Commissioner of the Washington Supreme Court entered an order denying Eyman's motion for a stay of non-monetary portions of the State's judgment against him pending his appeal. A copy of the Commissioner's September 14, 2021 ruling is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.
- 3. On December 1, 2021, Department I of the Washington Supreme Court unanimously denied Eyman's motion to modify the Commissioner's September 14, 2021 ruling. A copy of Department I's December 1, 2021 order is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.
- 4. On December 8, 2021, Eyman filed a motion for reconsideration of Department I's December 1, 2021 order denying his motion to modify.
- 5. The following day, December 9, 2021, the clerk of the Washington Supreme Court sent all counsel a letter stating that because "the Rules of Appellate Procedure do not allow for reconsideration of an order denying a motion to modify", Eyman's reconsideration motion "is rejected for filing." A copy of the Clerk of the Supreme Court's December 9, 2021 letter is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.
- 6. The Goodstein Law Group's Fifth Application for Compensation filed on February 24, 2022 includes two entries on December 7, 2021: 5.5 hours for \$2,172.50 and 4.2 hours for \$1,659.00 attributing an undefined portion of that time to their work on Eyman's procedurally improper motion for reconsideration.
- 7. One day later, on December 10, 2021, Eyman filed a motion seeking the recusal of the Washington Supreme Court's Commissioner in connection with his ruling denying Eyman's motion for a stay that was substantially similar to his rejected motion for reconsideration.

 The recusal motion set forth Eyman's displeasure with a single sentence of the

26

Commissioner's ruling denying Eyman's motion for a stay that was upheld by Department I of the Washington Supreme Court, but contained no allegations suggesting bias or any other reason to question the impartiality of the Commissioner. A copy of Eyman's motion for recusal is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

- 8. Four days later, on December 14, 2021, the Supreme Court's Commissioner denied Eyman's recusal motion stating that Eyman failed to "persuasively show that any reasonable person examining the entirety of the ruling would question the authoring commissioner's impartiality." A copy of the Supreme Court's Commissioner's December 14, 2021 ruling denying Eyman' motion for recusal is attached hereto as **Exhibit E.**
- On January 12, 2022, Eyman filed a motion to modify the Commissioner's December 14,
 2021 Order Denying Recusal with the Washington Supreme Court. A copy of Eyman's
 January 12, 2022 motion to modify is attached hereto as Exhibit F.
- 10. On February 1, 2022, the State filed its response to Eyman's January 12, 2022 motion to modify requesting that the Washington Supreme Court deny the motion and "consider admonishing [Eyman's] counsel that making baseless accusations in the future risks sanctions." A copy of the State's February 1, 2022 response to Eyman's motion to modify is attached hereto as Exhibit G.
- 11. On February 8, 2022, Eyman's Counsel filed a letter to the Clerk of the Washington Supreme Court requesting that their January 12, 2022 motion to modify be stricken. A copy of Eyman counsel's February 8, 2022 letter to the Clerk of the Washington Supreme Court is attached hereto as **Exhibit H.**

3

1	12. On February 11, 2022, the Washington Supreme Court granted Eyman's request to strike his
2	January 12, 2022 motion to modify. A copy of the Washington Supreme Court's ruling
3	striking Eyman's motion to modify is attached hereto as Exhibit I.
4	13. The Goodstein Law Group's Fifth Application for Compensation filed on February 24, 2022,
5	includes two entries relating to their failed and then abandoned effort for recusal of the
6	Supreme Court's Commissioner. On December 10, 2021, there is an entry for 3.5 hours and
7	\$1,382.50 for which an undefined potion is for "Redrafted motion to recuse". On December
8 9	14, 2021, there is an entry for .3 hours and \$88.50 for "Receipt and review of order denying
10	Motion to Recuse".
11	
12	14. The total amount of fees the Goodstein Law Group attributes all or a portion thereof to its
13	motion for reconsideration and its motion for recusal in its Fifth Application for
14	Compensation is: \$5,302.50.
15	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
16	EXECUTED this 16th day of March, 2022.
17	/s/ S. Todd Sipe
18	S. TODD SIPE, WSBA No. 23203 Assistant Attorney General
19	Assistant Attorney General
20	
21	
22 23	
24	
25	
26	